United Nations A/55/PV.84

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

84th plenary meeting
Tuesday, 12 December 2000, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Holkeri ..... (Finland)

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m.

Reports of the Sixth Committee

The President: The General Assembly will now consider the reports of the Sixth Committee on agenda items 154 to 165, 171, 172 and 184.

I request the Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, Mr. Drahoslav Štefánek of Slovakia, to introduce in one intervention the reports of the Sixth Committee before the General Assembly.

Mr. Štefánek (Slovakia), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee: I have the honour today to present to the General Assembly the reports of the Sixth Committee on the 15 agenda items allocated to it, namely, items 154 to 165, 171, 172 and 184.

I will start my introduction of the reports of the Sixth Committee with agenda item 154, entitled "Progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order". The relevant report of the Committee is contained in document A/55/604, and the draft decision recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is found in paragraph 6 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft decision, the General Assembly would decide to resume consideration of the legal aspects of international economic relations at its fifty-eighth session.

The Sixth Committee adopted the draft decision without a vote, and I hope that the Assembly will do the same.

I now invite the Assembly's attention to agenda item 155, entitled "Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts". The relevant report of the Committee is contained in document A/55/605, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is found in paragraph 8 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the Assembly would in particular appeal to all States parties to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 that have not yet done so to consider becoming parties to the Additional Protocols at the earliest possible date; call upon all States that are already parties to Protocol I, or those States not parties, on becoming parties to Protocol I, to make the declaration provided for under article 90 of that Protocol; and call upon all States which have not yet done so to consider becoming parties to the 1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its two Protocols and to other relevant treaties on international humanitarian law.

The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote, and it is hoped that the Assembly will do the same.

I now turn to agenda item 156, entitled "Consideration of effective measures to enhance the

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

00-79164 (E)

protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives". The relevant report of the Sixth Committee is contained in document A/55/606, and the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee to the General Assembly for adoption is set out in paragraph 8 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the Assembly would, inter alia, strongly condemn the recent acts of violence against diplomatic and consular missions and representatives, as well as against officials of intergovernmental organizations, and would urge States to take all necessary measures at the national and international levels to prevent any such acts of violence and to ensure, with the participation of the United Nations where appropriate, that such acts are fully investigated with a view to bringing offenders to justice.

It is hoped that the Assembly, like the Sixth Committee, will adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

I now invite the Assembly's attention to agenda item 157, entitled "Convention on jurisdictional immunities of States and their property". The relevant report of the Sixth Committee has been issued under the symbol A/55/607. The Sixth Committee recommends the draft resolution found in paragraph 11 of its report to the General Assembly for adoption.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would, inter alia, decide to establish an ad hoc Committee on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property, open also to participation by States members of the specialized agencies; and to further the work done, consolidate areas of agreement and resolve outstanding issues with a view to elaborating a generally acceptable instrument based on the draft articles on jurisdictional immunities of States and their property adopted by the International Law Commission at its forty-third session, and also based on the discussions of the open-ended working group of the Sixth Committee established under resolutions 53/98 and 54/101 and their results. The ad hoc Committee would meet for two weeks in March 2002.

The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote, and I hope that the Assembly will do the same.

I turn now to agenda item 158, entitled "Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its thirty-third session". The relevant report of the Sixth Committee on this item is contained in document A/55/608, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is found in paragraph 8 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would, inter alia, commend the Commission for the progress made in its work, reaffirm the mandate of the Commission to coordinate legal activities in the field of international trade law, and stress the importance of bringing into effect the conventions emanating from the work of the Commission. The Assembly would also request the Secretary-General to submit to it at its fifty-sixth session a report on the implications of increasing the membership of the Commission, and would invite Member States to submit their views on that issue.

The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. The Assembly may wish to do so as well.

I now turn on agenda item 159, entitled "Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its fifty-second session". The relevant report of the Sixth Committee is contained in document A/55/609, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is contained in paragraph 10 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the Assembly would, inter alia, express its appreciation to the International Law Commission for the work accomplished at its fifty-second session, in particular with respect to the topic "State responsibility", and would encourage the Commission to complete its work on that topic during its fifty-third session. The Assembly would also reiterate its invitation to Governments to respond to the questionnaire on unilateral acts of States circulated by the Secretariat, and to submit the most relevant national legislation, decisions of domestic courts and State practice relevant to diplomatic protection. The General Assembly would furthermore decide that the next session of the Commission shall be held at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 23 April to 1 June and from 2 July to 10 August 2001. It would recommend that the International Law Commission continue its work on the topics in its current programme.

Noting with appreciation the work done by the Commission on the topic "International liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not

prohibited by international law", the Assembly would also request the Commission to resume consideration of the liability aspects of that topic as soon as the second reading of the draft articles on the prevention of transboundary damage from hazardous activities is completed.

The draft resolution was adopted without a vote. It is hoped that the Assembly will adopt this draft resolution without a vote as well.

I now turn to agenda item 160, "Nationality of natural persons in relation to the succession of States". The report of the Sixth Committee on this item is contained in document A/55/610, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is found in paragraph 7 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would, inter alia, express its appreciation to the International Law Commission for its valuable work on this topic. It would also take note of the articles on nationality of natural persons in relation to the succession of States, presented by the International Law Commission in the form of a declaration, the text of which is annexed to the draft resolution. It would further invite Governments to take into account, as appropriate, the provisions contained therein in dealing with issues of nationality of natural persons in relation to the succession of States and recommend that all efforts be made for the wide dissemination of the text of those articles.

It is hoped that the General Assembly will, like the Sixth Committee, adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

Let me now turn to agenda item 161, "Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country". The report of the Sixth Committee on this item is contained in document A/55/611 and Corrigendum 1, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is found in paragraph 8 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the Assembly would, in particular, endorse the recommendations and conclusions of the Host Country Committee, request the host country to continue to take all measures necessary to prevent any interference with the functioning of missions and express its appreciation to the host country for its efforts. Furthermore, the Assembly would request the host country to consider removing the travel controls previously imposed on staff of certain missions and staff members of the Secretariat of certain nationalities. It would also request the host country to continue to take steps to resolve the problem relating to the parking of diplomatic vehicles.

The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. It is hoped that the Assembly will be in a position to act likewise.

I now turn to the report of the Sixth Committee under agenda item 162, "Establishment of the International Criminal Court". The report is contained in document A/55/612. The draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly is found in paragraph 8 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would, inter alia, call upon all States to consider signing, ratifying or acceding to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. The Assembly would also welcome the important work accomplished by the Preparatory Commission in the completion of the part of the mandate relating to the draft texts of the rules of procedure and evidence and the elements of crimes and request the Secretary-General to reconvene the Commission, in accordance with resolution F adopted by the Rome Conference, from 26 February to 9 March and from 24 September to 5 October 2001, to carry out the mandate of that resolution.

The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote and it is hoped that the Assembly will be in a position to do the same.

I now invite the Assembly's attention to agenda item 163, "Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization". The relevant report of the Sixth Committee is contained in document A/55/613 and Corrigendum 1, and the two draft resolutions which the Sixth Committee recommends to the General Assembly for adoption are contained in paragraph 14 thereof.

By draft resolution I, entitled "Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization", the General Assembly would, inter alia, request the Special Committee, at its next session from 2 to 12 April 2001, to continue its consideration of all proposals concerning the question of the maintenance

of international peace and security in all its aspects in order to strengthen the role of the United Nations. It would also request the Special Committee to continue to consider on a priority basis the question of the implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations related to assistance to third States affected by the application of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

The Assembly would further request the Special Committee to continue its work on the question of the peaceful settlement of disputes between States. Moreover, the Assembly would request the Special Committee to continue to consider proposals concerning the Trusteeship Council and to continue to consider, on a priority basis, ways and means of improving its working methods and enhancing its efficiency.

By draft resolution II, entitled "Implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations related to assistance to third States affected by the application of sanctions", the General Assembly would, in particular, renew its invitation to the Security Council to consider the establishment of further mechanisms or procedures, as appropriate, for consultations as early as possible under Article 50 of the Charter with third States affected by the application of sanctions under Chapter VII. It would welcome the measures taken by the Security Council since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 50/51, most recently the note by the President of the Council concerning the establishment of an informal working group to develop general recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of sanctions.

Furthermore, it would welcome the report of the Secretary-General containing a summary of the deliberations and main findings of the ad hoc expert group meeting on developing a methodology for assessing the consequences incurred by third States as a result of preventive or enforcement measures, and would request the Secretary-General to present to the Assembly any further views that he may have, as appropriate, on the deliberations and main findings, including the recommendations, of the ad hoc expert group.

Furthermore, the Assembly would decide to consider, within the Sixth Committee, or a working group of the Committee, at its fifty-sixth session, further progress in the elaboration of effective measures aimed at the implementation of the provisions of the Charter related to assistance to third States affected by sanctions.

These two draft resolutions were adopted without a vote by the Sixth Committee. The Assembly may wish to do the same.

I now turn to agenda item 164, "Measures to eliminate international terrorism". The report of the Sixth Committee is contained in document A/55/614. The draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is set out in paragraph 11 thereof.

Under the terms of draft resolution, the Assembly would, inter alia, strongly condemn all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whomsoever committed. Furthermore, the Assembly would decide that the Ad Hoc Committee established by resolution 51/210 of 17 December 1996 would continue to elaborate a comprehensive convention on international terrorism and would continue its efforts to resolve the outstanding issues relating to the elaboration of a draft international convention for the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism. The Ad Hoc Committee would also keep on its agenda the question of convening a high-level conference under the auspices of the United Nations to formulate a joint organized response of the international community to terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. The Assembly would further decide that the Ad Hoc Committee would meet from 12 to 23 February 2001 and that the work would also continue during the fifty-sixth session of the General Assembly, between 15 and 26 October 2001, within the framework of a working group of the Sixth Committee.

The Sixtn Committee adopted the draft resolution by a recorded vote of 131 votes in favour to none against, with 2 abstentions.

I now turn to the report of the Sixth Committee under agenda item 165, "Review of the Statute of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal". This report is contained in document A/55/615. The draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly is set out in paragraph 6 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the Assembly would introduce amendments to the Statute of the Tribunal with effect from 1 January 2001, in relation to the qualifications of its members and the

length of their terms of appointment, consideration of cases raising significant questions of law and other issues, such as the use of the six official languages of the Organization.

The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. It is hoped the Assembly will do the same.

I now invite the Assembly's attention to agenda item 171, "Observer status for the Inter-American Development Bank in the General Assembly". The relevant report of the Committee is contained in document A/55/616. The draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 7 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide to invite the Inter-American Development Bank to participate in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer. It would also request the Secretary-General to take the necessary action to implement the present resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. I hope that the Assembly will be in a position to do the same.

I now turn to agenda item 172, "Observer status for the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance in the General Assembly". The relevant report of the Committee is contained in document A/55/617. The draft decision recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is found in paragraph 8 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft decision, the General Assembly would decide to resume its consideration of, and defer a decision on, the request for observer status for the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance in the General Assembly to its fifty-sixth session.

The draft decision was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. I hope that the Assembly will do the same.

I finally turn to agenda item 184, "Observer status for the Economic Community of Central African States in the General Assembly". The relevant report of the Committee is contained in document A/55/648. The draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 7 thereof.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide to invite the Economic Community of Central African States to participate in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer. It would also request the Secretary-General to take all the necessary action to implement the present resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. I hope that the Assembly will do the same.

This concludes my introduction of the reports of the Sixth Committee. On behalf of the Committee, I wish to express our gratitude to you, Mr. President, for the guidance and assistance you accorded to the Sixth Committee throughout its work during this session. Let me also thank the Legal Counsel of the United Nations, Mr. Hans Corell, for his assistance and leadership provided to the Committee.

I also wish to thank the Chairman of the Sixth Committee, Professor Mauro Politi of Italy, as well as the Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Kenjika Ekedede of Nigeria, Mr. Salah Suheimat of Jordan and Mr. Marcelo Vázquez of Ecuador, for their valuable advice, support and friendship given to me.

I wish to also express my gratitude to the Secretary of the Sixth Committee, Mr. Václav Mikulka, as well as to the other members of the Secretariat of the Sixth Committee, in particular Ms. Sachiko Kuwabara-Yamamoto, Mr. Manuel Rama-Montaldo, Mr. Serguei Tarassenko, Mr. Vladimir Rudnitsky and also other officers, for their assistance throughout the session and in the preparation of the various reports of the Sixth Committee.

Before concluding, in order to submit indeed a comprehensive report, I should like to mention that a very popular draft resolution was submitted by Australia and several other co-sponsors. Under the terms of that draft, the members of the Sixth Committee and the Secretariat participated in the social gathering after the completion of the work of the Committee on 22 November. Since that draft resolution was implemented in the nearby Mica Bar within the 24 hours since its introduction, there was no need to incorporate the draft into a formal report. I would like to express my wish in this regard that all draft resolutions would be implemented in such a speedy manner, though not necessarily in the terms of the same substance.

The President: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Sixth Committee which are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Sixth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that:

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in the Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee."

May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Sixth Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Sixth Committee unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise in advance. This means that where a recorded vote was taken, we will do the same. I should also hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Sixth Committee.

Agenda item 154

Progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/604)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. The draft decision was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly too wishes to adopt the draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 154?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 155

Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/605)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/148).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 155?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 156

Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/606)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/149).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 156?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 157

Convention on jurisdictional immunities of States and their property

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/607)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly likewise wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/150).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 157?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 158

Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its thirty-third session

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/608)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly too wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/151).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 158?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 159

Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its fifty-second session

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/609)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 10 of its report. The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/152).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 159?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 160

Nationality of natural persons in relation to the succession of States

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/610)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly also wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/153).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 160?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 161

Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/611 and Corr.1)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly also wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/154).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 161?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 162

Establishment of the International Criminal Court

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/612)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly likewise wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/155).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 162?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 163

Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/613 and Corr.1)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 14 of its report.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization". Draft resolution I was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly too wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 55/156).

The President: Draft resolution II, entitled "Implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations related to assistance to third States affected by the application of sanctions", was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly also wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 55/157).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 163?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 164

Measures to eliminate international terrorism

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/614)

The President: The General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao

People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Lebanon, Syrian Arab Republic.

The draft resolution was adopted by 151 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 55/158).

[Subsequently the delegations of Botswana and Mozambique informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. Gomaa (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): I have asked for the floor to explain my delegation's vote on the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly on measures to eliminate international terrorism. It is an honour for me to inform the Assembly that all the Arab delegations have endorsed this statement.

All the Arab States condemn terrorism in all its aspects and forms, whether committed by individuals, groups or States. All the Arab delegations, therefore, cooperated in a positive and serious manner with the coordinator of the resolution that has been adopted and with other delegations, demonstrating great flexibility in reaching a balanced resolution.

The Arab delegations reaffirm their understanding of the second preambular paragraph of the resolution, which refers to all relevant General Assembly resolutions on measures to eliminate international terrorism, including resolution 46/51 of 1991, paragraph 15 of which states that the General Assembly

> "Considers that nothing in the present resolution could in any way prejudice the right to self-determination, freedom and independence, as derived from the Charter of the United Nations, of peoples forcibly deprived of that right referred to in the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, particularly peoples under colonial and racist regimes or other forms of alien domination, or the right of these peoples to struggle legitimately to this end and to seek and receive support in accordance with the principles of the Charter, the above-mentioned Declaration and the relevant General Assembly resolutions".

In this context, the Arab delegations would like to reiterate that what has been taking place in the occupied Arab territories, especially in recent weeks — the missile attacks, bombings and other military actions by land, air and sea by the occupying Israeli forces against the unarmed people of Palestine — is the embodiment of terrorism in all its aspects. In this context, the Arab delegations reiterate the right of the Arab peoples under the yoke of occupation to use all legitimate means to achieve their independence and self-determination, including armed struggle.

Mr. Mohamed (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): Before explaining my delegation's vote, I should like to take this opportunity to thank the representative of Australia for submitting this resolution to the members of the Sixth Committee. I congratulate her on the adoption of the draft resolution in the Committee on 22 November. I should like to express my deep regret that unforeseen circumstances prevented my being present on that occasion.

We endorse and support the statement made by the representative of Egypt with regard to the

resolution on measures to eliminate international terrorism.

The delegation of the Sudan has closely followed the progress of the resolution on measures to eliminate international terrorism up to its adoption by the General Assembly just a few minutes ago. Not only has the Sudan supported all resolutions under this item in the past, but we also took part in bilateral and other contacts conducted to elaborate the draft of the present resolution and to overcome the difficulties encountered with regard to certain paragraphs.

My delegation is pleased that the resolution contains a paragraph in which the General Assembly expresses its appreciation and satisfaction that, during the past session, a number of States ratified or acceded to international conventions to eliminate international terrorism. We also take pride in the fact that the Sudan now features prominently on the list of those States that have ratified or acceded to such conventions, in compliance with and in adherence to Sudan's international commitments and in response to the appeals of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as reiterated in its recent statement of 6 December 2000.

The delegation of the Sudan would like to take this opportunity to call upon all States Members of the United Nations to respond favourably to General Assembly resolutions in this connection and to abide fully by the letter and spirit of such resolutions with the objective of eliminating terrorism and on the understanding that terrorism cannot be compartmentalized. As we have seen, the United Nations cannot tolerate any form of State terrorism, which is the major cause of civilian suffering and social chaos in many parts of the world. We certainly believe that the most dangerous form of State terrorism is the recognition of and the material and political support rendered to rebel movements that seek and endorse violence as a means of achieving their political ends.

We are confident that all members of the Assembly agree that no democracy, no civilized nation, would accept bloodshed as one of its political tools.

Mr. Rodríguez Parilla (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The resolution that has just been adopted by the General Assembly is extremely important. It reaffirms the need for the General Assembly fully to exercise its functions in taking effective and strong action in the struggle against international terrorism, including the negotiation of a comprehensive convention on international terrorism containing a precise definition of the crime of terrorism, and the convening of a high-level conference on this issue.

The resolution strongly condemns terrorism in all its forms, considering it to be unjustifiable under any circumstances. It emphasizes the need to strengthen cooperation between States and international organizations and agencies in order to prevent, combat and eliminate terrorism.

The resolution's call for all Member States to adopt further measures in accordance with the Charter and international law to prevent terrorism is particularly important. It reiterates the General Assembly's appeal to States to refrain from financing, encouraging, providing training for, or otherwise supporting, terrorist activities.

Our delegation would also like to reaffirm the validity and soundness of all resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on this issue, especially resolution 46/51, which establishes the difference between international terrorism and the peoples' struggle for self-determination and against foreign occupation.

Cuba wishes to reiterate its strong condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, wherever and by whomever committed, including State terrorism or terrorism prompted or tolerated by States. At the same time, we will always oppose double standards and political manipulation of the issue through selective and discriminatory expressions of alleged condemnations.

The terrorist activities against Cuba continue to exist. Last 17 November, a plot to murder President Fidel Castro was dismantled in Panama after being revealed by Cuba. The Cuban American National Foundation arranged this plot through Posada Carriles, a well-known international terrorist who was the perpetrator of the 1976 bombing of a Cuban Airline jetliner flying over Barbados, which killed 73 people. Posada Carriles is responsible also for terrorist actions against 28 countries.

Posada Carriles is now detained in Panama, together with other terrorists from Miami and Central America. They were seized with twenty kilograms of C-4 and 50 packs of Semtex and the blueprints of the central hall of the University of Panama, as well as

other evidence proving that they were going to bomb the site during a meeting between President Fidel Castro and thousands of students. They could also have committed acts against other events at the Ibero-American Summit and could seriously have jeopardized the lives of other Presidents.

On 18 November, Cuba initiated an extradition process for the terrorists. On 29 November, Cuba made a formal request to, and is still awaiting a decision from, the Panamanian authorities, to whom Cuba reiterates its respect and confidence.

Cuba has guaranteed that due process will be carried out for the terrorists, that they will neither be put to death nor convicted to terms longer than 20 years and has also proposed that an international Latin-American court of law try them in Havana.

Meanwhile, the Government of the United States exerts great pressure on Panama to prevent extradition. This does not surprise us because United States Administrations have for decades organized, financed and carried out numerous terrorist acts against Cuba by using mercenaries such as these, because their policy of aggression, subversion and economic war against Cuba constitutes a direct incentive to terrorism against our country and also because they deliberately and openly allow, on American territory, the existence and actions of the Cuban American National Foundation and other terrorist organizations which continually finance, organize, provide the means for, and carry out, terrorist acts against Cuba.

Posada Carriles is a terrorist who knows many secrets. He was trained by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). As an officer of the CIA, he worked to bring together the most aggressive anti-Cuban mercenary groups. After the bombing of the jetliner in Barbados, he walked out of a Venezuelan prison while he was being tried and showed up again, receiving salaries from the CIA and State Department and as one of the ringleaders of the Contragate conflict with regard to Nicaragua under Oliver North's command. After that he worked for two Central American Presidents and orchestrated dozens of terrorist acts against Cuba and attempted to murder President Fidel Castro at the Cartagena Ibero-American Summit.

In 1997, Posada Carriles organized a campaign consisting of planting bombs in Havana hotels. He travelled to the United States several times and granted interviews to the New York Times and to Miami's TeleNoticias channel from El Salvador.

The behaviour of the United States does not surprise us, because it is in Miami that the other perpetrator of the jetliner bombing, Orlando Bosch, freely resides and carries out his political activity. Nor are we surprised because it is also in the United States penal courts that anti-Cuban terrorists are historically absolved, as was the case in December 1999 in Puerto Rico with the organizers of an attempt to murder President Fidel Castro on the occasion of the Ibero-American Summit meeting in Margarita Island.

The people of Cuba do not want revenge, but rather a just process and severe sanctions. They wish to act in accordance with the letter and spirit of the resolution we have just adopted. Anything that departs from it will inexorably be an incentive to terrorism against Cuba and a threat to the security of all Member States.

Mr. Al-Qahtani (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country wishes first and foremost to support the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Arab States regarding measures to eliminate international terrorism.

The delegation of the State of Qatar has provided all information regarding efforts made during consultations in the Sixth Committee in order to introduce a draft acceptable to all Member States that could be in agreement with the General Assembly resolutions relating to measures to eliminate international terrorism, in particular the second preambular paragraph of resolution 46/51 of 9 December 1991.

The resolution repeats the rights of countries to free themselves from hegemony and occupation and their right to self-determination, as well as the legitimate struggle of countries to be liberated from colonialist and racist regimes. This should, of course, apply to all legitimate resistance activities of the Palestinian people against Israel.

Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone): Sierra Leone supported the resolution just adopted on international terrorism. Our support, however, does not mean that we agree entirely with all its paragraphs.

Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone): Sierra Leone supported the resolution on international terrorism which has just been adopted. Our support, however, does not mean

that we agree entirely with all the paragraphs contained in that resolution.

Sierra Leone's position is that any document or convention on international terrorism must contain a comprehensive and clear definition of what we are trying to eliminate. My country, Sierra Leone, has been a victim of both regional and international terrorism. Therefore, we support all measures to eliminate international terrorism in all its manifestations, wherever and by whomsoever committed.

It is the understanding of my delegation that the second preambular paragraph of the resolution we have just adopted includes resolution 46/51. Even though we have indicated that we do not agree with all of the paragraphs of the resolution we have adopted, it is our conviction that half a loaf is better than none. Therefore, bearing in mind our experiences on this matter, Sierra Leone decided to support the resolution without any equivocation.

The President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the vote.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish speak in exercise of the right of reply.

May I remind members that statements in the exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second intervention and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Jacob (Israel): My delegation totally rejects the baseless allegations made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of some other States.

Egypt graciously hosted the Sharm el-Sheikh summit, at which an Israeli-Palestinian agreement was reached on ending the violence — an agreement which are working hard to implement. The summit recognized that neither side in this conflict has a monopoly on the status of victim and that both sides must act to bring about an end to the violence. Indeed, President Mubarak of Egypt spoke there of the need for both sides to return to the peace process in order to end the cycle of violence.

In this light, the words of the representative of Egypt, which seek to misrepresent Israel and terrorism, seems at the very best unreflective of Egypt's pronounced and greatly appreciated role as a supporter and facilitator of the Middle East peace process. Such a political manipulation of the resolutions of the United Nations serves only to undermine this Organization, which enjoys the respect of all parties in the region.

Certain States, while engaging in political accusations against Israel, continue to maintain that an act of terrorism — a car bomb in a crowded marketplace, for instance — is not to be regarded as terrorism if it is claimed to be in the cause of national liberation. Such a position, of course, ignores international law and repeated United Nations resolution, which clearly maintain that terrorism, whatever its form or motivation, is unjustified.

Terrorism is defined by what one does, not by what one does it for. Indeed, defending the bombing of innocents in the name of freedom fighting is simply incomprehensible. The perverse logic of these States would have us believe that those who target crowded buses or marketplaces are not terrorists, while those who seek to stop them are. In so doing, these States do a grave injustice to legitimate liberation movements.

I did not intend to engage in a polemic debate here. However, I was compelled to respond to the harsh statement made by the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Rosenstock (United States of America): The delegation of Cuba was out of order when it explained its vote, if that is the word for the diatribe of false accusations to which we have been subjected twice in the Assembly in explanation of vote. Such behaviour already occurred in the Sixth Committee, therefore under the rules that govern us it should not have been repeated. Repetition does not enhance its credibility. We will decline to dignify such out-of-order, irresponsible behaviour beyond saying we reject the accusations as false and regret that Cuba has seen fit twice to subject us all to such a diatribe.

Mr. Rodríguez Parrilla (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have not heard a single valid argument. We have little time, but many truths must be told. I will refute what has been said with several examples.

First, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) organized and carried out hundreds of acts of aggression and terrorism against Cuba, including the invasion of Girón — Bay of Pigs — and organized dozens of assassination attempts against President Fidel Castro. This was stated by the United States Congress itself in related investigations and has been

proved by dozens of declassified United States documents.

Without the encouragement and support of the United States policy of aggression against Cuba, there would be no terrorism against Cuba. If mercenaries had not been recruited, trained and employed for decades, they would not exist today.

Secondly, if the United States prosecuted terrorism against Cuba, this would not be happening. The United States is able to listen to conversations throughout the world and to photograph events anywhere on the planet. The CIA alone is investing more than $26 billion in this respect. The United States can trace funds to even the most secret banking accounts. How then can we believe the representative of the United States when he says that his country does not have the knowledge or the ability to do this?

Thirdly, those responsible for the in-flight explosion of a Cuban aircraft coming from Barbados were Orlando Bosch and Posada Carriles. What did the State Department say in a statement that was distributed in the Security Council? It said that the United States did not support or condone the illegal activities of Orlando Bosch. In fact, the opposite is true.

Here are the facts. Bosch is free in Miami today, carrying out political activities and writing for newspapers. In 1968 he was sentenced to 10 years in prison for a terrorist attack against a Polish vessel and for having threatened to destroy aircraft and ships belonging to Mexico, Spain and the United Kingdom.

The North American authorities granted him conditional freedom in 1972. In 1976, he masterminded the in-flight explosion of a Cuban airliner. In 1988, he returned to the United States, where he was arrested. The Department of Justice ordered his deportation, saying it had information indicating that the bombing of a Cuban aircraft had been a United Revolutionary Organization (CORU) operation led by Bosch. But that decision, supported by a Miami court, was later modified by a higher authority — that is to say, by President Bush. Bosch was given his freedom and allowed to live in the United States. According to *The New York Times* and the *Boston Globe*, this was the result of lobbying on the part of Senator Connie Mack, Congresswoman Ileana Ross and Jeb Bush, later a Republican leader in Florida, all of whom remain on the scene.

Fourthly, I can speak in greater detail about the other person, Posada Carriles. He was trained by the CIA in demolition and guerrilla warfare, was an informant of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in Miami, was used by the CIA to bring together the most aggressive anti-Cuban terrorist organizations, was responsible for numerous terrorist acts, including a bombing at the Permanent Mission of Cuba to the United Nations, was the organizer of the bombing campaign against Havana hotels and was involved in an assassination attempt against President Fidel Castro on Margarita Island.

After the sabotage of the Cuban plane, he resurfaced in Central America and was identified by the American pilot Hasenfus, who was shot down in Nicaragua as being his immediate boss in Contragate. According to the Tower Commission Report, President Reagan was informed of this by then National Security Adviser McFarlane. In subsequent Senate hearings, the CIA official Felix Rodriguez, one of the assassins of Che Guevara, stated that he had participated in organizing Posada's escape from the Venezuelan prison and in his inclusion in Oliver North's group.

According to United States Senate records, Posada also collected a salary in San Salvador as Support Director of the Nicaraguan Humanitarian Assistance Office — in other words, the State Department. A memorandum directed to Oliver North that was signed by Owen and Posada Carriles still exist. Posada Carriles was working for the White House in illegal activities and for the State Department in legal activities.

In 1996, Posada travelled freely to Miami. In June 1998, *The New York Times* published extensive information showing that the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF) financed the bombing campaign against Havana hotels through the Cuban-American Chávez Abarca, a New Jersey resident, using Posada Carriles and Central American mercenaries.

In addition to abundant evidence, the Cuban-American National Foundation issued a statement indicating that it supported unreservedly incidents of internal rebellion that had occurred in recent weeks at the island's hotels.

Shortly thereafter, four men travelling by boat were detained by the United States Coast Guard upon leaving Puerto Rico. The group leader, Angel Alfonso Alemán, a New Jersey resident, stated that he was on a

mission to kill President Fidel Castro. United States police officials noted that the vessel was registered in the name of a member of the Executive Board of the CANF, that one of the rifles found on board belonged to the President of that Foundation and that the vessel set sail from Coral Gables, Florida, from the private mooring of another Foundation member whose commercial partner is also the treasurer of the Mafia group.

The proceedings were also held in Union City, New Jersey. The owner of the vessel confirmed that the weapons were to be used to kill Fidel Castro, and he boasted about having visited the White House on four occasions: once with Reagan, once with Bush and twice with Clinton. He showed a photograph of him with Mr. Clinton, in which he appears with Senator Robert Torricelli. The photograph was taken a year ago at the Helms-Burton legislation signing ceremony.

These are the facts. What does the United States say in the Security Council? In response to the annoying assertions that my Government is hiding Posada Carriles, as far as we know, Posada Carriles is not in the United States. We believe that he is somewhere in Latin America.

In the Special Committee on Terrorism in 1999, it was said that the unfortunate reference — meaning to the Cuban delegation — is a matter of public domain and that the United States Government has repeatedly requested the Cuban Government to provide detailed information that could be referred to the authorities responsible for enforcing the law. It is not true. On 3 May 1997, a document was sent to President Clinton by former Senator Gary Hart that contained detailed and sensitive information on a number of terrorist acts against Cuba carried out from the United States between 1992 and 1997.

In June 1998, the United States Government sent a delegation to Cuba, led by a high-level FBI official, which received detailed information. In May 1998, President Clinton was sent a message with detailed information on the plans of the CANF to use Central American mercenaries to attack aircraft flying to Cuba. To date the United States has not taken any practical steps. The United States representative at the Special Committee said, referring to those detained in the attempt on Margarita Island, that those four individuals had been charged and the United States intended to follow the proceedings closely. That was not what happened. In December 1999, a federal court in Puerto Rico shamelessly absolved the terrorists. *The New York Times* published photographs of the celebration that followed announcement of the verdict at a nearby restaurant, which was attended by the accused and several jurors.

In conclusion, some of those detained in Panama are United States residents. Pedro Remón Rodríguez, who lives in Miami, killed an official of the Permanent Mission of Cuba to the United States. Guillermo Novo Sampol, a United States resident, fired a bazooka at the United Nations in 1964 and was involved in the murder of Orlando Letelier. Gaspar Jiménez Escobedo, a Miami resident, one of those closely involved with the CANF, participated in the murder of a Cuban official in Mexico, in an assassination attempt against the Ambassador of Cuba to the United Nations and in many attempts against the Cuban President.

More recently, the United States Congress, through its law on assisting victims of terrorism in effect ...

The President: I have to interrupt the speaker, but the 10-minute period is up.

Mr. Rodríguez Parrilla (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to finish. I need 30 seconds.

The President: I ask the representative of Cuba to be kind enough to conclude his statement.

Mr. Rodríguez Parrilla (Cuba): I was saying that the funds used for alleged compensation payment to families of perpetrators of terrorist acts against Cuba constitute direct encouragement of those operations. The next President of the United States — when we finally know who he is — will have the dilemma of maintaining the impunity or of implementing this resolution and pursuing and eliminating all terrorism against Cuba from his territory.

Mr. Gomaa (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): I have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply to respond to the Israeli representative's accusation that Egypt and the Arab countries have submitted false claims on the events in the occupied Arab territories. However, we wish to confirm that the accusations we have spoken of have been documented and recorded and have been the subject of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, as well as those of other international organizations and organs.

The Israeli representative forced the peace process — in which Egypt cherishes its central role — onto the question we are considering: combating terrorism. This has nothing to do with the subject matter and removes the question of terrorism from its appropriate perspective.

Mr. Obeid (Syria) *(spoke in Arabic)*: My delegation asked for the floor to reply to the allegations made by the representative of the Israeli occupation a little while ago. Our delegation fully supports the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Arab Group and also the reply and the explanations made by Egypt just now.

We would like to add that the claims of the representative of the Israeli occupation in his reply — that he knows international law — are baseless. Israel's claims regarding peace are just lies and have been exposed as such during the recent bloody days on which hundreds of martyrs — including children, women, the elderly and unarmed young people — have been deliberately killed.

Is this the international law of which the Israeli representative speaks, and claims that he understands? I do not think so, because this is not international law. International law does not allow the occupation of the land of others by force, nor the perpetration of the most heinous crimes against people under occupation. International law does not allow the innumerable atrocities and massacres that have been perpetrated by Israel in the occupied Arab territories since 1967 — atrocities and massacres that are documented in United Nations reports, General Assembly resolutions and Security Council resolutions. These are not allegations. Rather, the reports of the Secretariat provide proof of the crimes that have been committed by Israel.

Israel is the country that must be in the *Guinness Book of World Records* in this regard. Twenty-five Security Council resolutions have mentioned that Israel is the occupying Power, and yet the representative of Israel is still in this room. He should not be here at the United Nations. International law and the Charter of the United Nations require that every country that is a Member of the United Nations be peace-loving. This condition is not respected by Israel and has not been applied to Israel, which, since its inception via a Security Council resolution, has been occupying by force the land and territories of others, namely, the territories of Lebanon, Syria and Palestine.

Were we to apply international law, then the highest penalties should be imposed on Israel to force it to respect international legitimacy and to implement relevant Security Council resolutions, especially resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Among other things, Israel should immediately, completely and unconditionally withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories to the lines of 4 June 1967. In addition, the establishment of settlements and the arming of settlers to kill the Arabs who own the land, whose land has been occupied by force, is a war crime and a flagrant violation of international law and the Geneva Conventions.

The international community should act promptly to intervene to protect unarmed Palestinians who are being killed daily by planes, missiles and rockets and are being subjected to genocide. There are daily assassinations and sniper attacks, and all sorts of weapons are being used to kill people. Confronted by this, the international community should establish a criminal court to bring the Israeli war criminals to justice and should send international troops to protect the Palestinian people.

The staff of Mrs. Mary Robinson — the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights who was asked to investigate the crimes committed by Israel — have been subjected to aggression by Israeli settlers. There have been attempts to kill her and to prevent her from doing her job.

The international community knows full well that Israel is the one that lies and commits crimes and that the Arab people, who are subjected every day to genocide, are the ones who need protection and who need the international community to apply international law.

Mr. Diab (Lebanon) *(spoke in Arabic)*: I would not have asked for the floor were it not for the allegations made by the representative of Israel — allegations that, as usual, distort the facts. This is why the Lebanese delegation would like to express its support for the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Arab Group.

Lebanon also wants to confirm the explanation of vote it delivered in the Committee after voting on the draft resolution. In it Lebanon emphasized that it fully condemns all acts of terrorism that are part of organized violence. Such acts include killings,

assassinations, the taking of hostages, bombings, the hijacking of planes and other acts against civilians.

The appeal made to the international community by this resolution to combat terrorism in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations does not conform with the policy of occupation and killing followed by Israel. This appeal supports the position of Lebanon, which calls for making a distinction between State terrorism practised by Israel against civilians and resistance to the forces of occupation, which is protected by international laws and conventions.

I would like to remind the representative of Israel, just as an example, that in April 1996 the Israeli occupation forces intentionally bombed a United Nations camp where more than 106 people were seeking protection, including children, the elderly and women. Israel killed these people on purpose. This has been documented and confirmed by a representative of the Secretary-General after an investigation he conducted at the time.

We would also like to remind the Israelis of the bombing of the infrastructure of Lebanon at the beginning of this year. This bombing coincided with threats from more than one Israeli official, such as David Levy, the Foreign Minister, who threatened to burn the Lebanese territories and who threatened the Government, and the Israeli Chief of Staff, Saul Mofaz, who threatened to attack civilians if the Lebanese resistance continued its work against the occupation forces. Israeli aggression and threats against Lebanon and its civilians and its aggression against Palestinians and intentional killings of children — now having exceeded 300 people — expose the true uncivilized character of the Israeli policy of occupation and of attacking civilians. This is the real terrorism.

This policy is regrettable, since Israel is a Member of the United Nations and thus should be committed to respecting the United Nations Charter in its laws and in its actions. However, Israel speaks about international law while it allows the killing of civilians and violates the norms of international law and the Fourth Geneva Convention, as well as all basic ethical and moral laws. It is true that, as the representative of Israel said, terrorism is defined by what one does and not by what one does it for.

Mr. Jacob (Israel): I deeply regret the tenor of the intervention made by the Syrian representative, which is inappropriate in this Assembly. Although we truly wish to achieve a just, comprehensive and durable peace with our neighbours to the north, we have no delusions regarding the true character of the Syrian Government.

I, like my Syrian colleague, could also use undiplomatic language. I could remind the members of the Assembly that Syria is a dictatorship; Syria is a police State; Syria is a military occupier of almost half of the territory of a neighbouring State; Syria is the exploiter of this neighbouring State's economy and resources; Syria is a cultivator and trafficker of narcotics; Syria is a State that sponsors terrorism; Syria harbours in its capital terrorist organizations and activity that actively and violently oppose the peace process in our region. I could say that Syria brutally murders entire neighbourhoods — tens of thousands of its own citizens — in order to silence political dissent. However, I choose not to do so.

Yet, any statement voiced by the delegation of Syria should be considered in the light of these facts, which, although known by all, are diplomatically left unmentioned. It would suffice to say, however, that any Syrian representative's interpretation of the meaning of terrorism is inherently a contradiction of the term. As a matter of fact, when a regime such as that in Syria denigrates any other State for not complying with its view, I would interpret that as a compliment. I would therefore like to thank the representative of Syria for his comments because, coming from him, this unrestrained attack reassures me that Israel is indeed a nation that respects peace, justice and human dignity.

With regard to the statement made by the representative of Lebanon, I am bewildered. In the last six months, a radical change has occurred on the Israel-Lebanon border. Israel has withdrawn from Lebanon, fulfilling its responsibilities under Security Council resolution 425 (1978). The Secretary-General confirmed this complete withdrawal in his report to the Security Council, and the Council endorsed this report and also adopted a resolution to this effect.

Why then does the Lebanese representative continue to express his anger and frustration over the occupation of his country and the violation of its sovereignty as if nothing has happened? Could it be that these Lebanese sentiments have very little to do with Israel and its actions? Israel has never harboured any aspirations towards Lebanese territory or resources

and has always taken action with the sole purpose of maintaining security along its northern border and providing for its own self-defence. Perhaps these Lebanese feelings could be explained by the fact that there is another State neighbouring Lebanon that occupies its soil and violates its sovereignty.

Mr. Obeid (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): Our delegation abstained from the vote on the resolution just adopted. We abstained because we condemn terrorism in all its manifestations and forms and because this resolution does not contain a clear distinction between the kind of terrorism that we condemn as a crime and the right of people to resist foreign occupation in accordance with international law, international legitimacy and the United Nations Charter.

As for the crimes committed by Israel in the occupied Arab territories, they are examples of international terrorism. The lies of the representative of the Israeli occupation are totally baseless. There is a saying: lie, lie, lie — maybe it works.

Syria entered Lebanon by request of the Lebanese Government in order to protect Lebanese civilians from Israeli attacks and to apply the resolutions of the Taif Agreement regarding security in Lebanon. This is an internal matter between Syria and Lebanon, and there are brotherly treaties between them, implemented in accordance with the United Nations Charter and international legitimacy. This has nothing to do with the Israeli occupation of Arab territories and the massacres perpetrated by Israel against the Arab people under its occupation.

The representative of the Israeli occupation has told lies about Syria, accusations that are not documented or true. We fully reject them. It shows that they have no arguments to submit. They talk only to cover up their own daily crimes in the occupied territories. The United Nations resolutions prove their crimes; the Charter of the United Nations is clear; international law is clear. Israel is the one that occupies Arab territories, and the United Nations resolutions should be applied to force Israel to withdraw from these territories.

Mr. Diab (Lebanon) (*spoke in Arabic*): We truly regret the interventions of the Israeli representative, who attacks States. We were under the impression that we were discussing the question of terrorism, and we gave examples of Israeli terrorism against civilians.

We have cited examples of Israeli terrorism over the 22 years of its occupation of Lebanon's territory and its murder and maiming of Lebanese civilians and children with a variety of prohibited and unprohibited weapons. We had thought that this was the question under consideration, but when we gave our supporting arguments, the representative of Israel chose to discuss another issue, since he had no answer to our rightful accusations.

First, I would remind him that his country occupied Lebanon for 22 years, in contravention of Security Council resolution 425 (1978), which Israel flouted all that time. Secondly, we would ask what the Israelis are doing in the Sheba'a farmlands, which they continue to occupy and where they have increased their military presence. Does this military escalation in an occupied territory demonstrate a desire for peace or for war? Finally, we would remind the representative of Israel that the relationship between Lebanon and Syria is that of brothers. There is a cooperation and coordination agreement between the two countries; it is not a relation based on occupation, as the representative of Israel has depicted it.

Here, we would inquire about the fate of the 19 Lebanese civilian hostages kidnapped by the Israeli forces from their homes and currently held as hostages in Israeli prisons, a fact acknowledged by the Israeli Supreme Court. Is this not terrorism?

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 164.

Agenda item 165

Review of the Statute of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/615)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 6 of its report.

The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/159).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 165?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 171

Observer status for the Inter-American Development Bank in the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/616)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/160).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 171?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 172

Observer status for the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance in the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/617)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report.

The draft decision was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 172?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 184

Observer status for the Economic Community of Central African States in the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/55/648)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 55/161).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 184?

It was so decided.

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all the reports of the Sixth Committee before it.

Announcements

The President: Before we take up the items on the agenda for this morning, I would like to make an announcement concerning the United Nations Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on the Law of the Sea.

Members will recall that the General Assembly, by its resolution 54/33 of 24 November 1999, decided to establish an open-ended informal consultative process, in order to facilitate the annual review by the General Assembly of developments in ocean affairs by considering the Secretary-General's report on oceans and the law of the sea. It also decided that the meetings of this process would be coordinated by two co-chairpersons, who would be appointed by the President of the General Assembly, in consultation with Member States and taking into account the need for representation from developed and developing countries.

In this regard, the first meeting of the Consultative Process was held at United Nations Headquarters from 30 May to 2 June 2000. The meeting was co-chaired by the Permanent Representative of Samoa to the United Nations, Ambassador Tuiloma Slade, and Mr. Alan

Simcock of the United Kingdom, who were appointed by my predecessor.

Members will further recall that the General Assembly, by its resolution 55/7 of 30 October 2000, requests the Secretary-General to convene the second meeting of the Consultative Process, to be held in New York from 7 to 11 May 2001.

With regard to the co-chairpersonships of the second meeting of the Consultative Process next year, I have conducted extensive consultations, both through the chairs of regional groups and through a significant number of individual delegations, representing all regions. During these consultations wide support was expressed for the co-chairpersons of the first meeting of the Consultative Process. Both of them were highly praised for their excellence as mediators and consensus-builders.

It is therefore my great pleasure to announce my decision to re-appoint Ambassador Tuiloma Slade, Permanent Representative of Samoa to the United Nations, and Mr. Alan Simcock of the United Kingdom as the two co-chairpersons of the second meeting of the Consultative Process. However, some Member States also expressed the view that there may be a need to consider rotating the co-chairpersonship of this process. Thus, I should like to urge interested Member States to consider the issue of rotation as early as possible and to submit distinct nominations, through the appropriate channels, in regard to the co-chairpersons of the third meeting of the Consultative Process.

As delegations will have noted from this morning's *Journal*, and while on the subject of appointments, I would also like to indicate that — in the Working Group, after the plenary meeting is adjourned — I will be making an announcement of a similar nature concerning the Vice-Chairpersons of the Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters Related to the Security Council. The meeting of the Working Group will take place in this Hall immediately following the adjournment of this meeting.

Postponement of the date of recess

The President: Members will recall that at its 73rd plenary meeting, on 28 November 2000, the General Assembly decided that the General Assembly would postpone the date of recess of the fifty-fifth session to Friday, 15 December 2000.

However, I have been informed by the Chairman of the Fifth Committee that the Committee will still not be able to conclude its work before 20 December 2000. The Assembly will therefore not be able to conclude its work by that date. I would like, therefore, to propose to the Assembly that it postpone the date of recess of the current session to Friday, 22 December 2000.

If there is no objection, may I take it that the Assembly agrees to this proposal?

It was so decided.

Programme of work

The President: I would now like to inform members about some changes and additions to the programme of work of the General Assembly.

On Thursday morning, 14 December 2000, the General Assembly will resume consideration of agenda item 20 and its sub-items (a), (b) and (c), relating to humanitarian assistance. This will be to take up draft resolutions that will be ready for consideration.

On the same day the Assembly will also take up the following agenda items: agenda item 54, "Declaration of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity on the aerial and naval military attack against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya by the present United States Administration in April 1986"; agenda item 55, "Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security"; agenda item 56, "Consequences of the Iraqi occupation of and aggression against Kuwait"; agenda item 57, "Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations"; and agenda item 58, "Launching of global negotiations on international economic cooperation for development".

In addition, I would like to inform members that agenda item 17 (h), "Appointment of members of the Committee on Conferences", and agenda items 20 (d) and 46, relating to Afghanistan — originally scheduled for Friday afternoon, 15 December 2000 — are postponed to Tuesday, 19 December 2000.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.